Institute for Research on Public Policy

Institut de recherche en politiques publiques

The Use of Family Friendly Workplace Practices in Canada

Ana Ferrer
Lynda Gagné

September 2006

IRPP Working Paper Series
no. 2006-02

1470 Peel Suite 200 Montréal Québec H3A 1T1 514.985.2461 514.985.2559 fax www.irpp.org

The Use of Family Friendly Workplace Practices in Canada

Table of Contents

The Use of Family Friendly Workplace Practices in Canada*

Ana Ferrer (Department of Economics, University of Calgary)
Lynda Gagné (School of Public Administration, University of Victoria)

Summary

The increase in two earner households has changed the structure of the labour market, presenting employees, government and firms with new challenges. These changes have spurred an increasing interest in new workplace practices and policies that may respond to the requirements of the New Economy. Research in the area covers a variety of fields in social sciences and has mainly focused on the availability of benefits to workers with families.

However, a natural question that has only received passing attention is to what extent these benefits are being used by families. We investigate the factors that influence the use of work-family benefits, in particular whether or not benefits are being offered to those who need them or rather, whether there is a mismatch between the availability and need of benefits. We consider that a mismatch may exist because workers are not randomly assigned to firms that offer these benefits. Our estimates take into account the constraints affecting the availability of benefits by using a bivariate probit model with selection. Our analysis uses the Workplace Employee Survey (WES), which collects a broad range of information on a representative sample of employers and their employees following employers for a minimum of four years and employees for two years.

We find that accounting for selection is important in understanding the use of family friendly benefits. That is, workers who would use these benefits are not randomly distributed across firms. Therefore, conventional estimates of the determinants of benefit use are generally biased because they are based on the subsample of the population that has the benefit available to them. By comparing the conventional and corrected estimates we learn that, in some cases, benefit availability is either biased toward workers who are in no dire need of them, or are not used to solve the family-work conflict.

In particular, we confirm that full time workers do not seem to use flexible hours because of family-work conflict. On the other hand, female workers tend to choose firms that make telework available to their employees. This choice appears to be motivated by the existence of family demands. Finally, we find evidence

* We are thankful to Human Resources and Skills Development Canada for granting us remote access to the data and to Lucy Chung and Yves Decard for excellent support in data analysis. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors as are all errors and omissions.

of a mismatch in the provision of family benefits, which seems biased towards workers who are in no dire need of them. This is not surprising, since we also find that the availability of family benefits depends strongly on firm size, industry and occupation, suggesting that technological constraints are important in the determination of these benefits.

Introduction

Employers have long acknowledged the importance of providing opportunities within the workplace for skill development. However, it is only recently that this concept has been extended to include support for the conditions that *lead* to skill development and training. Among these, one of the most important is the recognition of the competing pressures of work and non-work commitments. This recognition has been fostered by the increase in the labour force participation of women over the last few decades, which has placed an increasing burden on dual earners families and single parents to balance work and family demands. According to recent estimates from the Labour Force Survey[1], in 2002 dual earners were 72% of all couples (up from 33% in 1965), and over 60% of all Canadian households with dependents. Moreover, 63% of all single parents work. The health costs alone of the work-family conflict have been estimated in over 3 billion CAN$ (Duxubury and Higgings (2005)), while the number of days lost to production has increased by 30% since 1997 to 9.6 days per year in 2005 (Statistics Canada CANSIM Table 2790029)

Both, employers and governments have responded to this challenge of the New Economy. In January 2001, the Federal Government extended combined maternity and parental leave benefits to one year under the Employment Insurance legislation. Governments also support and regulate the provision of childcare services and several childcare funding agreements have recently been negotiated with the provinces[2].

Similarly, some employers now provide family friendly benefits such as workplace childcare and Employment Insurance supplements for maternity, paternity and sick leave, as well as a variety of alternative work arrangements. It is the use of these employer-provided family friendly benefits that is the focus of this work. The interest on their effect is not limited to employees, but also extends to employers and policy-makers.

---

[1] Federal Labour Standards Review: http://www.fls_ntf.gc.ca/en/bg_01.asp

[2] On March 13, 2003, federal, provincial and territorial First Ministers Responsible for Social Services agreed on a framework for improving access to affordable, quality, provincially and territorially regulated early learning and child care services. As part of the Multilateral Framework, the Government of Canada agreed in 2003 to transfer $900 million to the provinces and territories over five years, to support their investments in early learning and child care. These agreements were cancelled in the new administration and replaced by the new Canada's Universal Child Care Plan. The plan provides direct support for parents through the $100 per month, per child under six Universal Child Care Benefit. In addition the initiative will provide incentives to create 25,000 flexible child care spaces per year through the Child Care Spaces Initiative, beginning in 2007. http://www.universalchildcare.ca/en/home.shtmlSocial Development Canada (2005).

Working parents' mental and physical health as well as their employer's perceived and actual support in the work-family conflict, affect productivity, job commitment, and children's welfare.[3] Therefore, issues of work-family conflict and their influence on workers and firm outcomes, as well as their potential resolution, are at the forefront of the policy agenda.

Government's involvement in the provision of family friendly benefits typically consists of the regulation of leave, pregnancy related insurance and the regulation of and subsidies for schooling/care for children.[4]

In this paper we look at the role of employers in the provision of family friendly benefits, focusing on employer provided benefits.[5] These are, of course, of crucial importance in countries with lower government involvement in social matters, but even in countries with significant welfare states, employers could play an important role in the provision of benefits providing an additional degree of flexibility. For instance, families may find convenient the possibility of working from home to save commuting time, or to have flexible schedules. These are types of family friendly practices that depend mainly on the firm and can hardly be subject to regulation. Finally, another reason to focus on employer provided benefits is that, as mentioned, its provision may be in the interest of employers themselves. These (firm provided) family friendly benefits are practices introduced voluntarily by the firms to help workers to reconcile the demands of work and family life (Evans (2001)). Firms have different instruments at hand to help employees to deal with work-family conflict. These could be classified in three groups:

a) Facilitating leave from work for family reasons. These policies include extensions to maternity leave, which may be paid or unpaid, other forms of parental leave and the possibility of taking career breaks.
b) Facilitating changes in the work schedule. These policies include all forms of work schedule reductions, like switching to part time, job sharing, reduced work week, etc... In addition, these policies may also accommodate family schedules by allowing, flexitime or work from home (telework).
c) Family support policies, which offer practical help with child/elder care assistance, including access to services, referral services or financial aid.

The types of family friendly benefits that we will analyze here are: flexible hours (an employee works a certain number of core hours, but can change the start and stop times provided that a full complement of hours

---

[3] McDonald, Phipps and Lethbridge (2005)
[4] There is much variation in the public provision of family benefits. See Gornick, Meyers and Ross (1996) for an international perspective.
[5] For an international perspective on the extent of employer provided family benefits see Evans, J.M. (2001).

is worked), telework (employees work at home (for pay) at least some hours of their regular schedule) and family support (the employer offers support regarding childcare, eldercare or other type of family support).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The next section reviews the literature on work-life conflict, both international and Canadian, and presents the rationale to examine the use as opposed to the availability of family benefits, as well as trhe highligts of the Workplace Employee Survey (WES) used to perform our analysis. The third section presents our results and the last concludes. The methodology and the models used for the analysis are presented in Appendix B, while all tables supporting the analysis have been grouped in Appendix A.

Literature Review

The literature on work-family conflict and its consequences for families and employers spans a number of disciplines, including psychology, organizational behaviour, and economics. Consequences of the work-family conflict range from mental health disorders, physical health problems, family strain, and employee absenteeism, high turnover rates and low productivity. A considerable amount of the related literature in organizational behaviour focuses on how employer support affects employee satisfaction and other variables of interest such as job attachment and employer/employee productivity measures, including absenteeism and/or subjective supervisor reports. A complete summary of this work is beyond the scope of this paper. In what follows we focus on the empirical literature on family friendly benefits relating to the economics of the firm.

One important branch of the family friendly practices literature centres on the employer benefits of implementing these practices. Gray (2002) uses British data on an employee-workplace linked survey to look at the impact of a wide arrangement of workplace characteristics (including family friendly benefits) on several measures of firm outcomes, such as financial performance, labour productivity, absenteeism, and quality of production, finding a positive association between family friendly benefits and most measures of firm outcomes. Glass and Riley (1998) use American data to look at the impact of family responsive policies on employee retention after childbirth, and find positive effects of maternity leave policies on reducing turnover. Similarly, Hofferth (2000) uses a hazard model to examine the effect of public and private policies on the probability that women will return to work after childbirth. More generally, Eaton (2003) suggests that family supportive practices involving flexibility increase commitment on the part of the workers, therefcre increasing productivity and reducing turnover. Gunderson (2002) summarizes the literature's findings on the impact of

workplace well-being, which often show positive impacts, but may not be justified if costs are also taken into consideration.

Other studies focus on the effects of policies for workers, assessing particular family friendly policies. Studies on the benefits of employer-provided childcare look at associations with resolution of work-conflict issues, absenteeism, and job attachment with a wide range of results. Goff et. al. (1990) find no effect, whereas Kossek and Nichol (1992) find that on-site childcare is associated with improved employee attitudes, recruitment and retention, but not with performance or absenteeism. Milkovich and Gomez (1976) in turn, find reduced turnover rates and absenteeism. Miller (1984) argues that there is no credible research showing a positive relationship between employer-provided childcare and absenteeism, turnover, recruitment or job satisfaction. Carole Barbeau (2001) offers a description of work related child-care centres in Canada, including some of the conditions that may promote their creation. The study seeks to analyze and illustrate how businesses and other organizations can establish and operate child-care centres for their employees. Dalton and Mesch (1990) find that teleworking also reduces absenteeism, while Riley and McCloskey (1997) suggest that it may have an impact on cost reduction.

A limited number of researchers use bivariate methods, multiple regression and/or logistic regression to examine the employee and/or employer characteristics associated with flexible schedules or non-standard work arrangements and/or family benefits. This work notes that, in general, family friendly benefits are found in larger, unionized firms (Glass and Fujimoto, 1995), while employees with dependents, women, union members and long-serving employees are more likely to be in firms with flexible time (Bardoel et. al. (1999), Cox and Presser (1999)). In addition, Golden (2001a, 2001b), using a probit model and the Current Population Survey, estimates that employees working more than 50 hours per week, Caucasians, men, married people, the more educated, and private sector employees are more likely to use flexible time.

The Canadian empirical literature on family benefits and/or work-conflict issues is limited and much of the analysis performed is descriptive in nature. Only a few studies use multivariate methods of analysis. Several studies look at the potential of family friendly practices as solution to the work-family conflict. Stone (1994) uses the 1988 Canadian National Child Care Survey (CNCCS), the 1990 and 1992 General Social Survey, and the 1991 Survey of Work Arrangements to look at factors giving rise to conflict between work and family responsibilities and at the impact of family obligations on labour force participation. More recently, Lipsett and Reesor (1997) use the 1991 and 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements to look at work arrangements incidence by employee/employer groups. They use descriptive bivariate analysis to identify broad relationships between worker/employer characteristics and work arrangements. In a similar study, Lowe and Schellenberg

(2001) recommend a supportive work environment and management, flexible work arrangements as work-life conflict moderators.

The availability and the use of family benefits

The literature mentioned so far focuses mainly on availability of benefits, with very few studies addressing the issue of the use of benefits. Most research about the use of work-family benefits has developed outside economics and is, in general, constrained both in the scope of benefits and in the extent of the sample studied. Secret (2000), summarizes this literature in her analysis of the incidence of family friendly benefits. Her own findings about the determinants of benefit usage indicate that firm characteristics are a better predictor of use than employee characteristics. However, her study is limited to 88 organizations of a local community employing 527 workers.

The lack of work in the study of benefit use is somewhat surprising. Further, given the magnitude of the work-family conflict described in the literature, one would expect to observe high rates of use, conditional on availability. Yet, overall usage of employer provided benefits is relatively low.[6] This emphasizes the point that availability does not imply use. Benefits may be offered to workers who do not use them because they are not needed or because they are unsuitable to their needs. If we want to ascertain the extent to which these benefits contribute to lessen work-family conflict, we are interested in use, rather than availability, of benefits.

This paper seeks to determine the factors that contribute to the use of employer provided family friendly benefits among Canadian workers taking into account the non random provision of benefit availability. We specifically consider flexible work scheduling, telework, and family support services. Rather than focusing on the availability of benefits only to determine incidence, we distinguish between use and availability of benefits. This allows us to explore the true incidence of family benefits by taking into account the firm's constraint in the supply of benefits. The present work contributes to the literature on family friendly benefits in two ways. First, it significantly fills the gap in the Canadian empirical literature by providing estimates of incidence of use of benefits using a nationally representative survey of workplaces and employees. Second, and more importantly, by distinguishing use from availability, we are able to offer some insight on the constraints that families with dependents may face in taking advantage of these benefits.

---

[6] For instance, in a 1993 Work/Family Directions study of 80 top U.S. corporations, employing 2.4 million workers, 85% of these companies say they offer flexible work programs. However, fewer than 2% of employees use telecommuting, job sharing and part-time schedules, and only 24% use flex-time. Salomon (1994)

This study is motivated by the observation that the use of benefits is not as widespread as the extent of the family–work conflict would suggest it should be. One would expect that a higher proportion of females than males would use these benefits, since traditionally a greater part of the family-work conflict lies on female workers. Comfort, Johnson and Wallace (2003) provide a descriptive analysis of the 1999 (first wave) of the Workplace and Employee survey (WES), which reveals that only 36% of females versus 44% of males use flexible time schedules; 4.9% females work from home as a part of their regular schedule (telework) versus 5.3% males. Additionally, families with dependents and single parents should benefit more from these benefits and higher rates of use are anticipated for these groups. The same study indicates that although families with dependents do have a slightly higher use of telework (6.7% among females versus the average use of 5.8%), that is not the case for the use of flexible schedules (34.6% of females with dependents use flexible schedules versus the average of 34.7%). This small proportion using flexible arrangements can be partially explained if we consider that flexible time and telework are available to only 50% and 10% of the workers respectively.

Given the costs of balancing family and work responsibilities, the above observation suggests that workers with families may not find these policies very useful. While flexible work arrangements and family friendly benefits may be of assistance to some families, they may not be useful to many others. For example, flexible hours and telework may be of little use to families with pre-school children, as many working parents will want to use full-time child care and full-time care is mostly available during regular work hours. Flexible hours may be most useful to parents with informal care arrangements who work part-time. Hours of work can then be scheduled around caregiver availability. Telework may have limited usefulness to parents, as children need to be attended to, and working at home restricts the attention that can be given to a child. On the other hand, telework reduces commuting time and may be useful to families with school age children as it maximizes the number of hours that can be worked while children are in school. Further, while childcare or eldercare may be quite useful, it will only be useful to workers with young children and eldercare responsibilities. Low wage workers may prefer less expensive informal child care arrangements to expensive workplace arrangements and low skill employers may have few incentives to provide such arrangements (at a cost) if workers are not willing to pay for them. More generally, it could be the case that the benefit, or a combination of benefits, is available to both parents and only one of them uses it (this would certainly be the case for workplace day care, but it could also be the case with the use of telework).[7] The lack of need for benefits can explain low usage,

[7] Alternatively, a benefit may be offered nominally, but not in practice. Salomon (1994) reports that firms rarely have formal policies regarding flexible work schedules. It is usually left to managers' discretion whether a worker is able to use this flexibility. The existence of a corporate culture that limits use of available benefits because workers feel that it would negatively affect their careers is well documented. See Eaton (2003).

but so can the lack of availability of benefits. If workers who need or would like benefits and would use them have no access to them, it would explain the low numbers of users.

To properly estimate the influence of different characteristics on the use of benefits using basic probit or logit models requires that workers be randomly distributed across firms that offer and do not offer benefits. However, that is hardly the case. We expect workers to choose jobs where benefits that would be useful to them are available, given their life plan and socioeconomic status. To account for this choice or selection process, we estimate a selection model where the use of a benefit depends on workers current demographic characteristics while controlling for employee selection into firms offering benefits. Conventional estimates of the impact of a worker's demographic characteristics on usage that do not take into account this selection are biased because they are based on the sample of workers that have the benefit available. Accounting for this problem, we provide corrected estimates that can be interpreted as representative of the worker population. Selection into firms offering benefits depends on long-term employee characteristics. Exclusion restrictions for the selection equation are provided by firm technology and local labour market constraints. These estimates will provide the true incidence of use of benefits among Canadian workers.

The Workplace Employee Survey

For our analysis we use the 1999-2002 Workplace and Employee Survey (WES). The survey collects a broad range of information on a nationally representative sample of employers and their employees, covering all industries except farming, fishing, hunting, trapping and public administration.[8] This is an important feature of the data as many studies are based on surveys with only a limited number of establishments surveyed. In addition, the linkage between employee and workplace data allows researchers to connect employee outcomes, such as wages, hours of work, training received etc... not only with the worker's own characteristics but also with firm characteristics and outcomes (organizational changes, human resources practices, profits...). Moreover, the WES follows sampled establishments for a minimum of four years and employees for two years. Both features are extremely uncommon in the literature on family friendly benefits. Indeed, to our knowledge this is the first study on benefit use that uses a nationally representative survey. This allows us to perform a variety of robustness checks, increasing the credibility of our results. In fact, the widespread representation of the sample, large sample sizes and the connection between employers and

[8] The survey frame on the workplace component was created from information on the Statistics Canada Business Register. Business locations were stratified into 252 relatively homogeneous stratas (groupings by industry (14), region (6) and size (3)) from where 9,144 businesses were sampled in 1999 and 6,322 surveys collected. The workplace sample is supplemented every two

employees information provide a rare opportunity to improve on the methods used to determine the incidence of family friendly benefits.

We will examine the following employer provided family friendly benefits:

Flex time or flexible hours: Under this work arrangement an employee works a certain number of core hours, but can change the start and stop times provided that a full complement of hours is worked. The question is stated explicitly to minimize reporting error: *"Do you work flexible hours? (This means you may work a certain number of core hours, but you can vary your start and stop times as long as your work the equivalent of a full work week)"* In the WES, employees report whether or not they participate in this arrangement (flex time use). Approximately 35% of females and 39% of males report using this benefit. Since many firms do not have formal policies regarding flexible time, we construct a variable for flex time availability at the firm based on this benefit being available to other similar workers in the firm.[9] Flexible time is available to 54% of female workers and 58% of male workers.

Telework: This is a type of work arrangement where employees work at home (for pay) at least some hours of their regular schedule. The employee responds the question: *"Is your work at home mainly:*

a) Paid and within your normally scheduled work hours?
b) Paid and in addition to your normally scheduled work hours?
c) Unpaid and in addition to your normally scheduled work hours?"

We consider that a worker is using telework if he answers (a) to the above question. Approximately 6% of the workers report using this benefit. Similarly to the case of flextime, we consider that telework is available if it is available to other workers in the firm with similar occupations. Approximately 11% of all workers have telework available to them.

Family support: The employee is asked whether his employer offers support regarding childcare, eldercare or other type of family support:

---

years with new workplaces added to the Business Register. Up to twenty four employees from every workplace were sampled using a probabilistic mechanism. On average 3.5 employees were interviewed from each stablishment.

[9] We define a benefit as available if other workers in similar broadly defined occupations within the firm report using the benefit. This definition underestimates the availability of benefits. Alternatively we define a benefit as available if any employee in the firm reports using the benefit. Note that this definition is likely to overestimate the incidence of availability. The results with the alternative definition (not reported here) are not significantly different from those using the more restrictive definition.

"Does your employer offer help for childcare either through an on-site centre or assistance with external suppliers or informal arrangements?",

"Does your employer offer help with eldercare services?" and

"Does your employer offer other personal support or family services?"

Each question is followed by a question regarding use (For instance, the question regarding childcare availability is followed by *"Did you use this help within the past twelve months?"*). Hence, this variable includes childcare, eldercare and other family support services.[10] This benefit includes different types of services that vary in terms of the type of supportive action taken by the employer. It may range from information and referral to actual on-site care centers. Child care services constitute approximately half of the services provided, but they are however only a third of the use of family services. For this reason, we present here results for the three forms of family support services grouped into a single category. Note that in this case we are able to define family support use and availability based on employee's answers to these questions. Around 2% of the workers report using this benefit and 12% report the benefit being available. This employee based definition of availability is not without problems. Miss-reporting may occur as employees that do not need the benefit are less likely to know about its availability.

The Use of Family Friendly Benefits

Table 1 shows the percentage of use and availability of benefits by gender and family type. Similarly to other studies, we do not find that females or families with dependents use family friendly benefits more than other groups. The proportion of female (male) users of flexible time is between 33.5% and 36.3% (38.2% to 41.2%) across all family types, where the lowest values corresponds to single parent households. There is some evidence of higher use of telework and family friendly benefits among workers with dependents, but the differences are surprisingly small. Between 5.5% and 7.3% of workers with dependents, use telework, versus 3.4% to 7.3% for workers with no dependents; further, between 1.8% and 2.7% of workers with dependents use family benefits, versus 1.1% to 1.9% for workers with no dependents. In addition, although benefits are slightly less available to (female) single parents, the distribution of availability by family type reveals that most benefits are equally available among all family types and that some, such as telework, are even more likely to be available to female workers with children. The conditional probabilities shown in the third and sixth column

[10] The questionnaire is not more specific about what other type of support could that be. However, it does not include fitness or recreational services or employee assistance (such as counselling, substance abuse control, financial assistance, legal aid etc) which are services specifically asked for in other (previous) questions.

of Table 1 further confirms the small uptake of benefits, specifically of family benefits, which is not over 22% for any family type. Conditional on availability, telework is used on average by 53% of workers, whereas flexible time is used by around 67% of workers.

We report the main characteristics of the sample by use and availability of benefits in Tables 2.1 and 2.2, respectively, separately for male and female workers.

Table 2.1 indicates that female workers who use flexible hours are only slightly more skilled than those who do not, particularly in terms of tenure or experience. This is in contrast with the use of telework or family benefits, which are generally associated with more educated and experienced workers. In general, users of benefits have more children than those who do not use benefits, and their youngest child tends to be older than the youngest child of nonusers, again particularly for telework and family benefits. However, single parents are not more represented among the users of benefits (approximately the same fraction of single parents, around 9%, can be counted among users and nonusers). Since it is difficult to argue against the need of those facing single parenthood to work in a family friendly environment, this could suggest that the benefits are either not suitable or not available for this particular group. Married workers are generally approximately equally represented in the user and nonuser categories, although a higher percentage of married males are represented in the telework and family benefits user categories than in the nonuser category. Married males and females are both more represented in the benefit available category for telework and family benefits. It is also worth noting that a slightly higher fraction of male telework users than nonusers are Caucasian, and that a higher fraction of male and female family friendly benefits users are non-Caucasians and immigrants than nonusers. This difference however, is not apparent in terms of availability of benefit.

According to Table 2.2, employees using flexible hours are over-represented in firms in Commerce (females) or Finance (males) relative to non users, while among users of family benefits, those in Other Services are over-represented relative to those who do not use the benefit. For telework, female users are over-represented in Finance and other Services while male users are similarly distributed between Construction, Finance and other Services. Users of flexible hours are more concentrated among smaller firms (up to 49 employees) than non users, and those using family benefits, particularly males, are clearly concentrated in larger firms (more than 500) relative to non users. There is a higher fraction of managers and professionals among users of these three benefits than among non users. In general, a higher proportion of users of flexible hours are unionized and work full time than of non users, but this is not the case for the other two benefits. Most labour market characteristics appear unrelated to the use of telework or flexible hours. However, workers who use family benefits are over represented in stratas with higher fractions of skilled

workers, high unionization rates or higher fractions of females of child bearing age. The same relationships hold for availability.

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 suggest that users of telework and family benefits are more educated and experienced, tend to be managers or professionals, and have more, though older, kids than non users. With some gender differences and relative to nonusers, availability and use of flexible hours is relatively more concentrated in smaller firms in Commerce, availability and use of telework is more concentrated in Finance and other Services, and availability and use of family benefits is more frequent in large firms in Other Services.

We briefly report in Table A2 the results of a probit estimation of the reduced form equation on the use of benefits. Our aim is to obtain a view of the main correlations that exist between incidence of benefits and the determinants of these benefits. It is important to note that the model underlying this table is a reduced form of all the forces that may be associated with the use of the benefits. As such, we cannot attribute any causal effect to the independent variables. Our estimates rather state the degree of correlation between our explanatory variables and the benefit analyzed. We report the marginal effect of a change in the independent variable on the probability of use for female workers and comment on the differences encountered using the sample of male workers when appropriated.

Flexible hours. This benefit refers to the use of a special arrangement, by which the worker attends the firm for a given number of core hours but has flexibility regarding the time of arrival and departure as long as he/she works for a given number of hours. This benefit is of use for those who find it difficult to accommodate childcare services' usual hours of operation with a rigid workplace schedule. Columns 1 and 2 of Table A2 suggest that this benefit is not driven by the needs of workers with families as the marginal effect of most demographic indicators is not significant. Rather, we find the strongest correlations among firm characteristics. High levels of education are positively related to the chances of using flex time for females as are occupations requiring high levels of education for males. This is consistent with evidence from other countries (Golden, 2001, Bardoel et Al. (1999)). It is interesting to note the differences regarding the influence of occupation and industry on the probability of use among male and female workers. This suggests that there may be asymmetries in the types of jobs that men and women perform within these categories. These differences may trigger technological constraints in the supply of benefits that account for the disparity of the estimates. For instance, if there are more females than males working as clerks in customer services departments in small firms, they may find more difficult to enjoy a flexible schedule than it would be if these tasks are performed in other departments.

Telework. This benefit refers to the participation of the employee in an arrangement that allows him/her to perform part of her duties at home, for pay, during regular scheduled time. This would seem a more flexible benefit than flextime, in that it reflects location of work rather than timing of work. It is also more likely to be family oriented, as it allows workers to cover for unexpected (or expected) interruptions of regularly scheduled care arrangements and saves workers commuting time. Columns 3 and 4 in Table A2 indicate that family characteristics are more correlated with the use of telework than flexible time, particularly for male workers. The effect of firm characteristics continues to be important and there are some gender differences regarding these effects. There is stronger evidence that this is a benefit available to more skilled employees, although this could be a reflection of the technological constraints imposed by the benefit per se. Note that firm size is negatively correlated with use for female (but not for male) worker. This supports evidence from many studies that smaller firms are more supportive of family needs than larger firms.

Family Benefit. This benefit refers to a wide variety of support practice for families that range from referral or information services to the existence of on-site facilities for child or elder care, or other family support benefits. There is an important difference between this benefit and the two previously studied in that it is more likely to impose significant sunk costs for the firm, although this is more likely to be the case for high-cost benefits such as on-site childcare than for referral services. We find low correlations between demographic characteristics and the use of this benefit as well as between human capital variables/occupation and use. Since, in general, this type of benefit represents a considerable sunk cost for the firm, once such cost is incurred in there seems to be little sense in restricting the use to some of the workers. Surprisingly, however, only limited evidence of a correlation with firm size is apparent from the reduced form estimation. As mentioned, there are important economies of scale in the provision of this benefit, which should make it difficult for small firms to offer it.

Selection Corrected Estimates

Family Characteristics

We turn now to the estimates of our selection model, reported in Table 3. For each benefit we show the results of the probit model stated in equation (1) (all equations are presented in Appendix B) in columns labelled (I). We compare these estimates with those resulting from our selection model, stated in equation (3), and report these in columns labelled (II). By comparing these two sets of estimates we can learn something about the importance of family characteristics in the process of selection. Conventional estimates that do not take into account that only some workers have access to benefits may underestimate (overestimate) the effect of family

characteristics on benefit use. For instance, if workers with high levels of family conflict tend to work in firms that offer telework, conventional estimates will overstate the importance of family characteristics on use of telework –when compared with estimates obtained under a selection model. If, on the other hand, workers with high levels of family conflict do not have access to this benefit, conventional estimates will understate the effect of family characteristics on use of telework. A Wald test of independent equations is reported in the third to last row for each selection model. The test indicates whether the use of selection model rather than a simple probit model is appropriate. The second to last row reports the predicted joint probability of use and availability (column I) and the predicted marginal probability of use (column II). The marginal probability can be interpreted as the fraction of workers who would use the benefit if it was available to every worker. Results are reported separately by gender.

Our results indicate that selection is important in understanding the incidence of benefit use. All the Wald tests for independent equations are higher than the critical value, except in the case of the use of telework by male workers where the test is only weakly significant. Furthermore, by comparing the estimates of the selection model with conventional estimates that do not take selection into account, we find a stronger influence of family characteristics on the use of family benefits under the selection model than that indicated with the independent regressions. This suggests that family benefits may not be available to workers who need them. The use of flexible hours, on the other hand, does not seem influenced by the family characteristics that define work-life conflict. Since the Wald test is highly significant, it is likely that other, unaccounted for, individual characteristics are behind the significance of the selection process. That is, workers who use flexible hours end up in firms that offer flexible hours for reasons other than to accommodate family demands. Finally, family characteristics do influence the use of telework among female workers who have the benefit available, but these effects disappear when we consider selection. This indicates that workers with higher levels of work-family conflict are more represented in firms that offer telework,. Hence, family demands are a likely factor in the selection process leading to the use of telework.

Specifically, the estimates of the selection model reveal that considering selection changes the importance of family structure in the use of flexible hours by female workers. For this group estimates indicate that only the presence of school aged children significantly affects the use of flexible hours. Furthermore, having younger children and the number of children, although not significant, negatively affects the probability of using flexible hours. The estimates do not change once selection is taken into account. Since the selection process is important, as indicated by the significance of the Wald test of zero correlation between the error terms of the use and availability equations, it must be that other unspecified factors influence both processes.

Interestingly, the difference between the predicted (joint) probability of use and availability, column (I), and the predicted marginal probability of use, column (II), is negligible. This suggests that females are fully selected into jobs where flexible hours are available. For male workers the presence of pre-school children positively affects the use of flexible hours, as does Caucasian ethnicity and immigrant status. Again, these results do not change when we correct the estimates for selection. Note that more men would use flexible hours if the benefit were available, as indicated by the difference between the probability of use and availability (41%) and the marginal probability of use (81%).

Marriage and school aged children positively affect the probability of using telework for male workers. The number of children positively affects the probability of females using this benefit, although the effect is not significant, and negatively that of men. This is indicative of women using telework to cope with childcare responsibilities, while men with children work outside the home. After controlling for selection, these effects remain significant for male but not for female workers. Since selection is important for female workers, we interpret this as indicating that work-family conflict influences the selection of this group into jobs that have telework available. Although more females would use telework were it generally available (26% versus 5%), it is unclear that the extension in use would be linked to the ease of the work-family conflict, as these variables are not significant when estimating the selection corrected model. Similarly, although more men would use telework if it were available (40% versus 5%) it is unlikely that this is linked to the resolution of the work family conflict since the signs of the estimates are not those predicted by the model.

Regarding family benefits, the presence of children increases the likelihood of females using the benefit, a fact that was masked when we did not take selection into account. Further, having pre-school or school aged children considerably increases the chances of using family benefits for both genders, a fact not apparent with the uncorrected estimates. Interestingly, single mothers are more likely to use these benefits than married mothers, further supporting the hypothesis that family benefits are most useful for workers with families and high potential work-family conflict.[11] The predicted probability of use would double if the benefit became available to all workers. However, it is a small impact (only 5% of all workers would use it).

Firm Characteristics

We show in Table A3 estimates of the factors that influence availability of benefits. Columns labelled (I) show coefficient estimates of the influence of firm and labour market characteristics on availability on a probit

regression of equation (2) for a particular benefit and gender. Columns labelled (II) show the coefficient estimates of the availability equation in the selection model (3). We remark only on the sign of the correlation between availability and explanatory variables. There is evidence that firms may be offering these benefits to attract/retain more educated workers (telework and family benefits), and workers with more experience (telework) or higher ranked occupations (male and telework, and female managers) as indicated by the positive estimated coefficient for these variables. We also find that firm size imposes constraints on the provision of benefits with larger firms being more likely to supply benefits. The magnitude of these effects is most important for family benefits. The most notable effect of industry is the difference across genders in the direction of the effect.

Regarding labour market characteristics, we find evidence that firms competing for educated workers are also more likely to offer family benefits or telework. Furthermore, a high fraction of females of child bearing age in the strata positively affects the availability of family benefits for females, but not for males. In this regard, being in a strata with a high degree of unionization makes it less likely that male workers have access to telework or flexible time. We believe that the difference in this effect by gender is related to the fact that these benefits are not, in general, suitable for manufacturing and primary industries, which encompass a high degree of unionized workers and stratas. Females, on the other hand, are more often concentrated in industries more suitable for the use of these benefits and can benefit from unionization.

Hours of Work

In our analysis of use of benefits we have included indicators for hours of work to account for time constraints to take care of family demands, under the assumption that hours of work are exogenously determined. However, an important issue regarding the robustness of these estimates concerns the possible endogeneity of hours of work. This is a particular concern with the use of telework and flexible hours, since these benefits could be demanded for reasons other than the existence of family-work conflict as considered here. Hence, the choice of hours of work may be related to the choice of benefit use through some unobservable individual characteristic. For instance, according to Table 2.1, there are fewer full time workers among users of flexible hours and telework than among non users. It is therefore plausible that workers with low taste for rigid and demanding schedules choose both jobs that are flexible or can be performed from home and less hours of work, regardless of family responsibilities.

---

[11] A single mother is represented by the intercept and the dummy variable representing her child combination. On average, a single woman with children is therefore more likely than a married woman with the same number of children due to the negative effect of

To check the robustness of our estimates to this problem we repeat the regressions in Table 3 for a sub-sample of full time workers and show the marginal effects in Table 4.[12] Results for family benefits and flexible hours are virtually unchanged when we consider the sub-sample of full time workers, suggesting that our previous estimates where not strongly biased. Note, however, that the Wald test is no longer significant for female workers using flexible hours. This indicates that the importance of the selection process for this group, discussed above, affected mostly the estimates for part-time female workers.

In the case of telework, however, fulltime male and female workers look much more alike than was the case when we looked at the full sample. In particular, only the presence of school aged children remains significant for male workers and becomes now significant for female workers as well. For male workers, selection is not significant and the (marginal) probability of use remains the same (40%). On the other hand selection is significant for female workers but the (marginal) probability of use is 19% (versus 26% for the full sample). We interpret this result to mean that hours of work may be endogenous for female workers using telework, with females with lower taste for demanding schedules or formal job environments choosing to work less hours and at home, influenced by the presence of school aged children.

Single Parents

We have mentioned that, despite considerable improvements the WES allows in the analysis of family friendly practices, thanks to its sample structure and large sample sizes, individual responses pose a problem on the interpretation of results. Namely, having no information about overall availability of benefits for the household, we are unable to infer much from observed gender differences in use. In addition, we cannot generally address the question of whether or not one of the reasons for low use is "dual" access to benefits. We can, however, partially answer this question by looking at the probability of use among single parents. Single parents are less likely to have access to a partner's benefits. If the corrected estimates of the demographic variables that trigger use are not significant, it can be interpreted as evidence that the benefit in question is less adequate to deal with work and family demands and not because the benefit is available through a partner's job.

Table 5 shows the results from regressions similar to those of Table 3 estimated for the sub-sample of single parents. To account for the small numbers of single parents in the sample, we have made the model

---

the "married" indicator.

[12] Conventional treatment of this endogeneity problem using selection models or instrumental variables is complicated in this case since we are already correcting for a selection issue. In addition, the WES contains no suitable instruments to correct for this problem.

more parsimonious. The use equation collapses the three indicators for age of the youngest child to a single indicator variable for children less than 11, and the three indicators for number of children to a unique indicator for more than one child. The results of the analysis indicate that selection is only important in understanding use of family benefits among single parents. The ordinary probit estimates (Column I) do not reveal significant effects for any variable, except Caucasian ethnicity. Accounting for selection, on the other hand, reveals that females are more likely than males to use this benefit and that the probability of use increases with the presence of additional children. We also note that Canadian born and non Caucasian workers are more likely to use the benefit. The difference in the estimates of demographic variables in (I) and (II) suggests that family benefits are not available to single parents who would use them, even though the corrected estimates indicate that this benefit is of particular importance for these workers to balance work and family demands. Despite the relevance of the selection model (Wald test of independent equations equals 14.46), it is unclear that expanding the use of this benefit to workers that have no access would have impact as the predicted probability of use remains unchanged under both models. The similitude of these estimates with those reported in Table 3 does not suggest that dual access to benefits is a likely reason of low use for flexible hours and family benefits. In addition, these estimates strengthen those from Table 3 since this sub-sample of workers is less likely to have meaningful access to a partner's benefits.

Gender and having young children also affect the probability of use of telework, and the presence of young children affects the use of flexible hours among single parents. However, the Wald tests indicate that the estimates from the selection model are not, overall, significantly different from those obtained from an independent regression in the case of telework or flexible hours.

Conclusion

We find that accounting for selection is important in understanding the use of family friendly benefits. A Wald test of independent equations supports our notion that estimates of the determinants of benefit use that do not take into account the selection of workers into firms that offer these benefits are generally biased, by rejecting the hypothesis that a selection model is not adequate. Moreover, estimates of the influence of explanatory variables on use of benefits resulting from selection model differ from those obtained without correcting for selection. Overall, both results support the idea that, for some benefits, availability is either biased toward workers who are in no dire need of them, while other benefits are not used to solve the family-work conflict. In particular we find that:

a) The distribution of workers into firms that provide flexible hours is not random, however, working flexible hours does not appear to be primarily used to solve family-work conflicts, particularly for fulltime workers (either male or female workers).

b) Female workers are over represented in firms that offer telework. This selection appears to be motivated by the existence of family demands, as indicated by the difference between the conventional and corrected estimates. Firms interested in helping female workers with work-life issues may consider offering telework as an alternative to office work.

c) The provision of family benefits seems biased towards workers who do not need them. This is not surprising, since we also find that the availability of this benefit depends strongly on firm size, industry and occupation, suggesting that technological constraints are important in the determination of family benefits. It is dubious, however, that increasing the availability of family benefits would have a big impact on family-work conflict, given the low uptake of this benefit even under corrected estimates

d) Not surprisingly, females jointly choose to work less hours and at home. Having school aged children is a significant determinant of this choice.

e) Dual access to benefits is not likely a reason of low use for flexible hours and family benefits.

These findings outline an important role for the government in the provision of benefits. Since the benefits that would appear to be most helpful to workers (family benefits and telework) are difficult to implement for many firms because of technical constraints, governments remain a major player in the provision of solutions to the work-family conflict. In addition, gender differences in the use of benefits indicate that females still carry the main burden of family responsibilities. Therefore, there is still a considerable amount of room for public policy in facilitating equal gender roles in the provision of family care and in easing the work-family conflict. Public policy can assist in the resolution of work family conflict through a variety of programs including funded extended parental leave and convenient and affordable child care arrangements but could also prevent firms from discriminating against employees using family benefits.

An issue that arises in our analysis of the incidence of benefits is that they need only to be available to one of the workers in the family. Therefore, using an individual, rather than a household, survey may influence some of the differences among gender than we found here. In this respect, the results from the analysis of single parents support the findings that we obtain for the more general sample of workers.

APPENDIX A: TABLES

Table 1. Percentage Use and Availability of Benefits by Family Type

	Females			Males		
Family type	Use of Flextime	Flextime Available	U/A*	Use of Flextime	Flextime Available	U/A*
No partner-no children	36.3	54.4	67	41.2	57.9	71
Partner-no children	34.6	53.0	65	39.3	58.6	67
Partner + children	34.6	54.9	63	38.2	57.2	67
No partner +children	33.5	50.6	66	38.4	57.8	66
Total	35.3	53.9	66	39.2	57.8	68
	Use of Telework	Telework Available	U/A*	Use of Telework	Telework Available	U/A*
No partner-no children	3.4	7.8	44	3.7	7.6	49
Partner-no children	5.2	10.2	51	7.3	12.8	57
Partner + children	7.3	12.8	57	6.3	12.1	52
No partner +children	6.3	9.7	65	5.5	11.6	47
Total	5.6	10.5	53	5.9	11.2	53
	Use Family Benefits	Family Benefits Available	U/A*	Use Family Benefits	Family Benefits Available	U/A*
No children - No partner	1.9	11.0	17	1.4	10.4	13
No children - Partner	1.1	12.7	09	1.7	13.2	13
Children – Partner	2.7	12.3	22	2.2	11.7	19
Children - No partner	2.3	10.6	22	1.8	11.9	15
Total	2.0	12.0	17	1.9	11.9	16

U/A = Probability of use conditional on availability.
Note P(Use|Availability) = P(Use + Availability)/P(Availability)

Table 2.1. Mean characteristics by use of benefit

	FEMALES					
	Flexible hours		Tele-work		Family Benefits	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Human Capital						
Tenure	0.64	0.56	0.61	0.64	0.61	0.62
Experience	1.53	1.45	1.49	1.72	1.50	1.58
Trade/College	0.53	0.54	0.54	0.47	0.54	0.54
Bachelor's	0.18	0.21	0.18	0.31	0.19	0.30
Graduate	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.14	0.07	0.10
Industry						
Manufacturing	0.12	0.08	0.11	0.08	0.11	0.09
Construction	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.13	0.08	0.08
Commerce	0.25	0.34	0.30	0.14	0.29	0.12
Finance	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.24	0.18	0.18
Other Services	0.36	0.32	0.34	0.40	0.34	0.51
Occupation						
Managerial	0.08	0.13	0.09	0.20	0.09	0.15
Professional	0.19	0.20	0.19	0.34	0.19	0.24
Technical	0.33	0.30	0.32	0.28	0.30	0.33
Clerical	0.33	0.31	0.33	0.17	0.31	0.20
Firm size 49	0.27	0.29	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.22
Firm Size 499	0.20	0.17	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.23
Firm size 500 +	0.22	0.18	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.31
Union	0.30	0.22	0.28	0.26	0.27	0.34
Full time	0.75	0.66	0.72	0.69	0.72	0.81
Strata						
Skilled	0.29	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.34
Skilled females	0.16	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.19
High union rates	0.42	0.35	0.39	0.38	0.39	0.54
Female child bearing age (FCBA)	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.58	0.61
Unionized in FCBA	0.19	0.14	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.22
Demographics						
Married	0.67	0.67	0.66	0.67	0.67	0.67
Single parent	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10
Age younger child	6.01	5.92	5.91	7.17	5.96	6.81
Number children	0.86	0.88	0.85	1.16	0.86	1.09
Canadian born	0.82	0.83	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.76
Caucasian	0.82	0.83	0.82	0.83	0.83	0.77
Observations	22,281	10,801	31,101	1,981	32,361	721

* A strata reflects the geographic location from where the firm is more likely to draw their workers. It is defined by the set of observations in a given province, industry, and for a given firm size.

Table 2.1 (continued). Mean characteristics by use of benefit

	MALES					
	Flexible hours		Tele-work		Family Benefits	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Human capital						
Tenure	0.73	0.62	0.69	0.66	0.69	0.68
Experience	1.91	1.76	1.84	2.10	1.85	1.89
Trade/College	0.48	0.46	0.47	0.43	0.47	0.52
Bachelor's	0.16	0.23	0.18	0.37	0.19	0.26
Graduate	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.14	0.09	0.16
Industry						
Manufacturing	0.29	0.18	0.26	0.10	0.25	0.29
Construction	0.21	0.22	0.21	0.27	0.21	0.17
Commerce	0.22	0.25	0.23	0.16	0.23	0.14
Finance	0.12	0.19	0.14	0.24	0.14	0.17
Other Services	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.22	0.14	0.20
Occupation						
Managerial	0.14	0.22	0.16	0.36	0.17	0.20
Professional	0.12	0.18	0.13	0.29	0.14	0.20
Technical	0.54	0.44	0.51	0.30	0.50	0.43
Clerical	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.04	0.10	0.08
Firm size 49	0.31	0.33	0.32	0.31	0.32	0.25
Firm Size 499	0.21	0.17	0.20	0.15	0.20	0.20
Firm size 500 +	0.20	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.19	0.40
Union	0.31	0.21	0.29	0.17	0.28	0.33
Full time	0.82	0.79	0.84	0.75	0.83	0.87
Strata *						
Skilled	0.23	0.24	0.23	0.28	0.23	0.28
Skilled females	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.10	0.12
High union rates	0.42	0.32	0.39	0.31	0.38	0.52
Female child bearing age (FCBA)	0.42	0.45	0.43	0.48	0.43	0.44
FCBA unionized	0.13	0.09	0.12	0.10	0.12	0.15
Demographics						
Married	0.72	0.71	0.71	0.81	0.71	0.78
Single parent	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04
Age younger child	6.13	5.59	5.91	6.16	5.89	7.43
Number children	0.97	0.93	0.95	1.00	0.94	1.29
Canadian Born	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.77
Caucasian	0.81	0.82	0.81	0.86	0.82	0.76
Observations	27,223	15,989	40,841	2,371	42,432	780

* A strata reflects the geographic location from where the firm is more likely to draw their workers. It is defined by the set of observations in a given province, industry, and for a given firm size.

Table 2.2. Mean characteristics by availability of benefit

	FEMALES					
	Flexible hours		Tele-work		Family Benefits	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Human Capital						
Tenure	0.63	0.60	0.61	0.64	0.61	0.68
Experience	1.55	1.46	1.48	1.66	1.47	1.70
Trade/College	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.50	0.54	0.52
Bachelor's	0.16	0.22	0.18	0.33	0.18	0.30
Graduate	0.06	0.17	0.06	0.14	0.06	0.12
Industry						
Manufacturing	0.13	0.09	0.11	0.06	0.11	0.07
Construction	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.12	0.08	0.07
Commerce	0.26	0.30	0.30	0.11	0.30	0.11
Finance	0.19	0.17	0.17	0.22	0.18	0.19
Other Services	0.33	0.37	0.33	0.49	0.32	0.56
Occupation						
Managerial	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.16	0.09	0.11
Professional	0.15	0.23	0.17	0.45	0.18	0.32
Technical	0.31	0.32	0.33	0.25	0.32	0.30
Clerical	0.37	0.28	0.33	0.13	0.34	0.22
Firm size 49	0.26	0.29	0.28	0.26	0.29	0.18
Firm Size 499	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.15	0.18	0.21
Firm size 500 +	0.18	0.23	0.20	0.32	0.17	0.47
Union	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.27	0.24	0.42
Full Time	0.77	0.67	0.72	0.70	0.71	0.82
Strata						
Skilled	0.27	0.29	0.28	0.34	0.27	0.37
Skilled females	0.15	0.16	0.15	0.19	0.15	0.21
High union rates	0.37	0.41	0.38	0.47	0.36	0.61
Female child bearing age (FCBA)	0.58	0.59	0.58	0.60	0.58	0.61
FCBA unionized	0.17	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.16	0.28
Demographics						
Married	0.66	0.67	0.66	0.74	0.66	0.70
Single parent	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.08
Age younger child	5.95	6.00	5.90	6.69	5.95	6.23
Number children	0.85	0.88	0.85	1.04	0.86	0.89
Canadian born	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.83	0.80
Caucasian	0.82	0.83	0.82	0.86	0.82	0.83
Observations	15,621	17,461	29,300	3,782	29,177	3,905

* A strata reflects the geographic location from where the firm is more likely to draw their workers. It is defined by the set of observations in a given province, industry, and for a given firm size.

Table 2.2 (continued). Mean characteristics by availability of benefit

	MALES					
	Flexible hours		Tele-work		Family Benefits	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Human Capital						
Tenure	0.71	0.67	0.69	0.71	0.68	0.77
Experience	1.89	1.83	1.83	2.04	1.83	1.99
Trade/College	0.48	0.47	0.48	0.44	0.47	0.46
Bachelor's	0.16	0.21	0.17	0.35	0.18	0.28
Graduate	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.16	0.08	0.16
Industry						
Manufacturing	0.28	0.21	0.26	0.11	0.25	0.25
Construction	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.25	0.22	0.16
Commerce	0.24	0.23	0.24	0.13	0.24	0.13
Finance	0.11	0.17	0.13	0.22	0.14	0.15
Other Services	0.12	0.16	0.13	0.27	0.12	0.28
Occupation						
Managerial	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.27	0.17	0.14
Professional	0.10	0.17	0.12	0.35	0.13	0.26
Technical	0.49	0.51	0.52	0.34	0.51	0.43
Clerical	0.13	0.09	0.11	0.03	0.11	0.08
Firm size 49	0.31	0.33	0.32	0.32	0.34	0.18
Firm Size 499	0.21	0.19	0.20	0.16	0.20	0.21
Firm size 500 +	0.17	0.21	0.18	0.28	0.15	0.51
Union	0.31	0.26	0.29	0.26	0.26	0.42
Full Time	0.88	0.81	0.84	0.78	0.77	0.88
Strata *						
Skilled	0.22	0.24	0.23	0.30	0.23	0.31
Skilled females	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.14	0.09	0.14
High union rates	0.40	0.37	0.39	0.36	0.36	0.59
Female child bearing age (FCBA)	0.42	0.44	0.43	0.48	0.43	0.45
FCBA unionized	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.20
Demographics						
Married	0.72	0.72	0.71	0.79	0.71	0.75
Single parent	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
Age younger child	6.06	5.82	5.75	6.50	5.85	6.45
Number children	0.96	0.95	0.92	1.03	0.95	0.96
Canadian born	0.80	0.82	0.81	0.81	0.82	0.77
Caucasian	0.81	0.82	0.81	0.85	0.82	0.79
Observations	17,458	25,754	38,396	4,816	38,401	4,811

* A strata reflects the geographic location from where the firm is more likely to draw their workers. It is defined by the set of observations in a given province, industry, and for a given firm size.

Table 3. Estimates of the Marginal Effects* of Family Characteristics on Use of Benefits by Gender. (P-values)

	Flexible Hours				Telework				Family Benefits			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)
Married	-0.00	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.09	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.01
	(0.94	(0.46)	(0.54)	(0.40)	(0.00)	(0.46)	(0.00)	(0.06)	(0.11)	(0.04)	(0.21)	(0.30)
Age 0-2	0.02	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.00	-0.03	-0.01	-0.05	0.00	0.03	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.68)	(0.85)	(0.30)	(0.54)	(0.72)	(0.70)	(0.22)	(0.46)	(0.99)	(0.23)	(0.39)	(0.65)
Age 3-5	-0.02	0.02	0.07	0.06	-0.01	0.02	-0.00	-0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.07
	(0.67)	(0.41)	(0.10)	(0.01)	(0.78)	(0.66)	(0.90)	(0.80)	(0.85)	(0.50)	(0.22)	(0.08)
Age 6-11	0.07	0.05	-0.01	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.16	0.01	0.08	0.00	0.03
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.73)	(0.48)	(0.06)	(0.28)	(0.15)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.01)	(0.35)	(0.08)
1 Child	0.02	-0.03	-0.01	-0.01	0.02	0.06	-0.02	-0.13	0.01	0.05	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.65)	(0.37)	(0.76)	(0.65)	(0.11)	(0.42)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.31)	(0.09)	(0.22)	(0.53)
2 Children	-0.01	-0.02	0.03	-0.01	0.02	0.01	-0.01	-0.11	0.01	0.07	-0.00	0.00
	(0.89)	(0.51)	(0.61)	(0.81)	(0.22)	(0.93)	(0.22)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.07)	(0.60)	(0.95)
3 or more	-0.02	-0.02	0.03	-0.01	0.04	0.12	-0.02	-0.16	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.03
	(0.68)	(0.56)	(0.53)	(0.77)	(0.06)	(0.18)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.44)	(0.22)	(0.35)	(0.40)
Canadian Born	0.00	0.00	-0.07	-0.05	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03	-0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.01
	(0.93)	(0.74)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.33)	(0.73)	(0.58)	(0.55)	(0.50)	(0.89)	(0.79)	(0.53)
Caucasian	0.03	0.02	0.06	0.03	0.02	-0.00	0.02	0.06	-0.00	-0.02	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.02)	(0.09)	(0.00)	(0.94)	(0.02)	(0.19)	(0.56)	(0.30)	(0.23)	(0.33)
Wald test ?=0 *		14.20		11.87		15.50		2.39		19.86		17.83
Predicted Prob.of Use	0.36	0.36	0.42	0.81	0.05	0.26	0.05	0.40	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.05
Observations	17,402	17,402	22,893	22,893	33,082	33,082	43,212	43,212	33,082	33,082	43,212	43,212

* Test of significant correlation between the error terms of the availability and use equations

Note:

Column (I) shows the marginal effects of use of benefit in a probit regression of use of benefit on family characteristics.

Column (II) shows the marginal effects of use of benefit in a selection model of use of benefit conditional on benefit availability. The selection equation includes controls for worker's tenure, experience, education, union status and occupation, controls for industry, firm size, fraction of skilled male and female workers in the strata, fraction of females of child bearing age in the strata and an indicator for high level of unionization in the strata

Both models include controls for hours of work, year and location.

Flexible hours includes observations for the 1999-2000 wave only

Table 4. Marginal Effects of Family Characteristics on Benefits Use. Full time workers (P-values)

	Flexible hours		Telework		Family Benefits	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Married	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.09	-0.04	0.01
	(0.78)	(0.26)	(0.79)	(0.12)	(0.03)	(0.18)
Age 0-2	0.04	0.00	-0.02	-0.02	0.04	-0.02
	(0.62)	(0.89)	(0.73)	(0.77)	(0.23)	(0.59)
Age 3-5	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.03	0.07
	(0.81)	(0.03)	(0.85)	(1.00)	(0.45)	(0.12)
Age 6-11	0.09	0.01	0.08	0.18	0.11	0.04
	(0.11)	(0.44)	(0.07)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.07)
1 Child	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.09	0.09	-0.02
	(0.82)	(0.41)	(0.67)	(0.23)	(0.08)	(0.46)
2 Children	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	-0.10	0.09	-0.00
	(0.86)	(0.45)	(0.88)	(0.21)	(0.10)	(0.90)
3 or more	-0.00	-0.01	0.11	-0.13	0.06	0.03
	(0.99)	(0.85)	(0.23)	(0.16)	(0.34)	(0.48)
Canadian Born	0.05	-0.04	-0.01	-0.03	-0.01	0.00
	(0.22)	(0.01)	(0.74)	(0.56)	(0.53)	(0.85)
Caucasian	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.06	-0.02	-0.01
	(0.91)	(0.29)	(0.56)	(0.22)	(0.49)	(0.42)
Wald test ?=0 *	0.02	14.73	27.29	1.42	9.58	13.00
Predicted Probability of Use	0.61	0.81	0.19	0.40	0.07	0.06
Observations	13,769	19,716	25,371	37.125	25,371	37.125

* Test of significant correlation between the error terms of the availability and use equations

Note:
Columns show estimates of the marginal effects of use of benefit from a selection model. The selection equation includes controls for worker's tenure, experience, education, union status and occupation, controls for industry, firm size, fraction of skilled male and female workers in the strata, fraction of females of child bearing age in the strata and an indicator for high level of unionization in the strata.
Model includes controls for hours of work, year and location.
Flexible hours includes observations from the 1999-2000 wave only

Table 5. Estimates of the Marginal Effects* of Family Characteristics on Use of Be

	Flexible Hours		Telework	
	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)
Gender	0.06	0.01	-0.01	-0.17
	(0.04)	(0.89)	(0.60)	(0.04)
Age youngest 0-11	-0.01	0.09	0.02	0.22
	(0.74)	(0.07)	(0.14)	(0.01)
Presence of Children	-0.02	0.02	0.00	0.01
	(0.46)	(0.53)	(0.81)	(0.90)
Canadian Born	-0.04	-0.10	0.02	0.01
	(0.38)	(0.18)	(0.32)	(0.95)
Caucasian	0.03	0.01	0.01	-0.08
	(0.46)	(0.89)	(0.38)	(0.42)
Wald test ?=0 *		0.00		0.06
Predicted Prob. of Use	0.34	0.68	0.05	0.54
Observations	4,822	4,822	4,822	4,822

* Test of significant correlation between the error terms of the availability and use equati

Note:

Column (I) shows the marginal effects of use of benefit in a probit regression of use of b
Column (II) shows the marginal effects of use of benefit in a selection model of use of b
Both models include controls for hours of work, year and location.
The selection equation in (II) includes controls for worker's tenure, experience, union sta
size, fraction of skilled male workers in the strata, fraction of females of child bearing ag
unionization in the strata.

enefits for Single Parents (P-values)

	Family Benefits	
	(I)	(II)
	-0.01	-0.02
	(0.17)	(0.01)
	0.00	0.01
	(0.88)	(0.28)
	0.01	0.01
	(0.21)	(0.06)
	0.01	0.01
	(0.21)	(0.04)
	-0.02	-0.02
	(0.11)	(0.08)
		14.46
	0.02	0.02
	4,822	4,822

ons

benefit on family characteristics.
enefit conditional on benefit availability.

tus and occupation, controls for industry, firm
e in the strata and an indicator for high level of

Table A1. Mean of main variables

		Female	Male
Human Capital	Tenure	0.61	0.69
	Experience	1.50	1.85
	Trade/College	0.54	0.47
	Bachelor's	0.19	0.19
	Graduate	0.07	0.09
Industry	Manufacturing	0.11	0.24
	Construction	0.08	0.21
	Commerce	0.28	0.23
	Finance	0.18	0.14
	Other Services	0.35	0.14
Occupation	Manager	0.09	0.17
	Professional	0.20	0.14
	Technical	0.32	0.50
	Clerk	0.32	0.10
Firm Size	22- 49	0.28	0.32
	50-499	0.18	0.20
	500+	0.21	0.19
Hours of work	30-39	0.67	0.66
	40-49	0.04	0.14
	50+	0.01	0.03
Union		0.27	0.28
Strata *	Skilled	0.28	0.24
	Skilled Females	0.15	0.10
	High Unionization	0.39	0.38
	Female Child Bearing Age (FCBA)	0.58	0.43
Demographics	Married	0.67	0.72
	Single parent	0.09	0.05
	Age younger child	5.98	5.92
	Canadian born	0.82	0.81
	Caucasian	0.82	0.81
Benefits	Use Flexible hours	0.35	0.39
	Use Telework	0.06	0.06
	Use Family Benefits	0.02	0.02
	Use Child Care	0.01	0.01
	Flexible hours Available	0.54	0.58
	Telework available	0.11	0.11
	Family Benefits available	0.12	0.12
	Child Care Available	0.07	0.07
Observations		33,082	43,212

* A strata reflects the geographic location from where the firm is more likely to draw their workers. It is defined by the set of observations in a given province, industry, and for a given firm size.

Table A2. Reduced Form Estimates of the Use of Benefits by Gender
Marginal Effect of a Change on Independent Variable (P-values)

	Flexible Time		Telework		Family Benefits	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Demographic Characteristics						
Married	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00
	(0.22)	(0.90)	(0.27)	(0.10)	(0.03)	(0.63)
Youngest Age 0-2	-0.05	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01
	(0.10)	(0.98)	(0.49)	(0.35)	(0.91)	(0.32)
Youngest Age 2-5	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
	(0.53)	(0.36)	(0.65)	(0.44)	(0.56)	(0.14)
Youngest Age 5-12	0.02	-0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01
	(0.34)	(0.24)	(0.10)	(0.04)	(0.02)	(0.19)
1 Child	-0.05	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.01	-0.01
	(0.08)	(0.94)	(0.11)	(0.02)	(0.26)	(0.10)
2 Children	-0.04	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01
	(0.23)	(0.64)	(0.28)	(0.08)	(0.19)	(0.28)
3 Children +	-0.04	-0.00	0.04	-0.02	0.01	0.00
	(0.34)	(0.97)	(0.08)	(0.03)	(0.52)	(0.66)
Canadian Born	0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.00	0.00
	(0.38)	(0.44)	(0.29)	(0.81)	(0.59)	(0.77)
Caucasian	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	-0.00	-0.00
	(0.14)	(0.40)	(0.01)	(0.07)	(0.32)	(0.30)
Worker Characteristics						
Tenure	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	-0.00	-0.00
	(0.03)	(0.11)	(0.84)	(0.01)	(0.73)	(0.92)
Experience	-0.05	-0.02	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.00
	(0.03)	(0.30)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.58)	(0.72)
Trade/Col	0.03	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.004
	(0.03)	(0.29)	(0.16)	(0.29)	(0.44)	(0.05)
Bachelor	0.05	0.05	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
	(0.00)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.46)
Graduate	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01
	(0.00)	(0.06)	(0.01)	(0.69)	(0.48)	(0.03)
Union	-0.05	-0.06	-0.05	-0.04	0.01	-0.01
	(0.23)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.52)	(0.23)
Manager	0.11	0.18	0.16	0.12	-0.00	0.00
	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.94)	(0.95)
Professional	0.04	0.21	0.13	0.14	-0.01	-0.00
	(0.22)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.22)
Technical	-0.00	0.08	0.06	0.04	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.93)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.24)	(0.26)
Clerk	-0.03	0.05	0.04	0.03	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.29)	(0.12)	(0.02)	(0.07)	(0.04)	(0.20)

Table A2 (continued). Reduced Form Estimates of the Use of Benefits by Gender
Marginal Effect of a Change on Independent Variable (P-values)

	Flexible Time		Telework		Family Benefits	
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Firm Characteristics						
Manufacturing	-0.12	0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	-0.00
	(0.00)	(0.79)	(0.05)	(0.36)	(0.00)	(0.88)
Construction	-0.11	0.10	-0.00	0.05	-0.01	-0.00
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.92)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.88)
Commercial	0.04	0.13	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	-0.01
	(0.43)	(0.00)	(0.04)	(0.06)	(0.00)	(0.17)
Financial	-0.04	0.20	-0.00	0.05	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.45)	(0.00)	(0.93)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.29)
Other Services	-0.03	0.17	-0.01	0.05	-0.01	-0.01
	(0.56)	(0.00)	(0.56)	(0.01)	(0.07)	(0.24)
Firm size 20-49	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	-0.00	-0.00	0.01
	(0.39)	(0.60)	(0.02)	(0.83)	(0.81)	(0.19)
Firm size 50-499	-0.04	-0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	0.01
	(0.05)	(0.70)	(0.00)	(0.15)	(0.19)	(0.25)
Firm size 500+	-0.05	0.03	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	0.02
	(0.03)	(0.20)	(0.00)	(0.38)	(0.40)	(0.02)
*Strata Characteristics**						
Skilled	0.11	-0.27	-0.04	0.06	0.03	0.07
	(0.48)	(0.03)	(0.35)	(0.19)	(0.20)	(0.00)
Skilled females	-0.05	0.04	0.20	-0.06	-1.05	-0.10
	(0.85)	(0.87)	(0.00)	(0.32)	(0.17)	(0.06)
High union rates	0.00	-0.03	0.00	-0.01	0.00	0.01
	(0.83)	(0.06)	(0.75)	(0.33)	(0.18)	(0.02)
Female Child bearing Age	-0.21	-0.06	-0.09	0.00	0.01	0.02
	(0.00)	(0.37)	(0.00)	(0.99)	(0.36)	(0.06)
Unionized*FCBA	-0.02	-0.05	0.04	0.06	-0.01	0.01
	(0.75)	(0.35)	(0.17)	(0.00)	(0.41)	(0.49)
Observations	17,402	43,212	33,082	43,212	33,082	43,212
Predicted probability of use	0.36	0.39	0.04	0.04	0.014	0.014

Note: Includes controls for year, location and hours of work

- A strata reflects the geographic location from where the firm is more likely to draw their workers. It is defined by the set of observations in a given province, industry, and for a given firm size.
- FCBA stands for Females of Child Bearing Age

Table A3. Estimates* of Firm and Labour Force Characteristics from the Availability / Selection Models by Gender

	Flexible Hours				Telework				Family Benefits			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
	(I)	(II)*	(I)	(II)*	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)
Tenure	-0.06	0.02	0.02	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	-0.05	-0.05	0.00	-0.00
	(0.13)	(0.39)	(0.63)	(0.99)	(0.84)	(0.73)	(0.27)	(0.53)	(0.08)	(0.09)	(0.87)	(0.87)
Experience	-0.12	-0.10	-0.01	-0.00	0.24	0.21	0.18	0.16	0.05	0.04	-0.00	0.01
	(0.12)	(0.03)	(0.85)	(0.95)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.39)	(0.53)	(0.96)	(0.87)
Trade/Col	0.03	-0.01	-0.10	-0.08	-0.03	-0.03	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03
	(0.11)	(0.71)	(0.03)	(0.05)	(0.46)	(0.48)	(0.24)	(0.21)	(0.66)	(0.57)	(0.49)	(0.52)
Bachelor	0.02	-0.00	0.09	-0.07	0.09	0.07	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.16	0.07	0.08
	(0.50)	(0.98)	(0.20)	(0.26)	(0.11)	(0.21)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.18)	(0.13)
Graduate	0.14	-0.00	0.12	0.13	0.21	0.18	0.05	0.05	0.22	0.21	0.18	0.16
	(0.03)	(0.96)	(0.05)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.34)	(0.37)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Union	-0.27	0.08	0.06	0.02	-0.30	-0.23	-0.36	-0.36	0.47	0.54	0.14	0.19
	(0.11)	(0.45)	(0.55)	(0.87)	(0.11)	(0.21)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.09)	(0.02)
Manufacturing	-0.23	-0.12	-0.15	-0.12	-0.17	-0.14	-0.04	0.00	-0.60	-0.40	0.09	0.10
	(0.09)	(0.30)	(0.14)	(0.18)	(0.34)	(0.39)	(0.75)	(0.98)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.25)	(0.17)
Construction	-0.09	0.03	0.10	0.11	0.27	0.33	0.44	0.47	-0.33	-0.16	0.25	0.25
	(0.50)	(0.83)	(0.34)	(0.23)	(0.12)	(0.04)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.04)	(0.29)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Commercial	0.26	-0.01	0.21	0.20	-0.25	-0.22	-0.16	0.17	-0.57	-0.41	0.15	0.16
	(0.07)	(0.93)	(0.10)	(0.06)	(0.19)	(0.22)	(0.28)	(0.26)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.11)	(0.08)
Financial	0.30	-0.07	0.46	0.40	0.11	0.12	0.31	0.31	-0.44	-0.32	0.05	0.032
	(0.06)	(0.62)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.55)	(0.49)	(0.04)	(0.05)	(0.01)	(0.04)	(0.63)	(0.85)
Other Services	0.24	-0.15	0.60	0.51	0.11	0.18	0.37	0.36	-0.45	-0.36	0.05	0.03
	(0.15)	(0.28)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.58)	(0.32)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.01)	(0.04)	(0.66)	(0.78)
Manager	0.19	0.11	0.57	0.50	1.07	1.02	1.11	1.12	0.20	0.21	-0.11	-0.13
	(0.13)	(0.19)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.25)	(0.18)
Professional	0.04	0.29	0.86	0.69	1.22	1.22	1.38	1.40	0.04	0.10	0.02	0.04
	(0.71)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.68)	(0.33)	(0.86)	(0.69)
Technical	-0.11	0.16	0.53	0.30	0.65	0.63	0.77	0.79	0.11	0.10	-0.09	-0.09
	(0.32)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.21)	(0.11)	(0.26)	(0.30)
Clerk	-0.21	-0.02	0.25	0.15	0.36	0.34	0.39	0.40	-0.02	0.01	-0.05	-0.05
	(0.06)	(0.74)	(0.05)	(0.21)	(0.01)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.81)	(0.89)	(0.63)	(0.63)
Firm size 20-49	-0.15	0.17	0.06	-0.03	0.06	0.13	0.19	0.21	0.22	0.26	0.27	0.28
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.55)	(0.67)	(0.49)	(0.12)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Firm size 50-499	-0.09	0.17	0.11	0.00	-0.01	0.06	0.04	0.07	0.48	0.50	0.53	0.56
	(0.22)	(0.00)	(0.20)	(0.99)	(0.84)	(0.43)	(0.68)	(0.44)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Firm size 500+	-0.22	0.26	0.30	0.18	0.08	0.20	0.07	0.23	0.76	0.80	1.02	1.04
	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.06)	(0.49)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.02)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)

Table A3 (continued). Estimates* of Firm and Labour Force Characteristics from the Availability / Selection Models by Gender

	Flexible Hours				Telework				Family Benefits			
	Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male	
	(I)	(II)*	(I)	(II)*	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)	(I)	(II)
Labour Force Characteristics (In Strata)[2]												
Skilled	-0.22	0.15	-0.99	-0.93	-0.27	-0.05	0.70	0.82	0.82	0.97	1.34	1.31
	(0.70)	(0.73)	(0.06)	(0.06)	(0.66)	(0.93)	(0.14)	(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.07)	(0.00)	(0.00)
Skilled females	0.25	-0.15	-0.23	-0.29	2.13	1.42	0.07	-0.16	0.44	0.40	0.15	0.31
	(0.27)	(0.84)	(0.82)	(0.75)	(0.02)	(0.11)	(0.93)	(0.84)	(0.55)	(0.59)	(0.84)	(0.65)
High union rates	0.06	0.07	-0.10	-0.07	-0.10	-0.14	-0.14	-0.15	0.02	-0.00	0.09	0.04
	(0.36)	(0.14)	(0.17)	(0.25)	(0.25)	(0.09)	(0.04)	(0.03)	(0.80)	(0.88)	(0.06)	(0.38)
FCBA[3]	-0.96	0.23	-0.58	-0.26	-0.88	-0.64	-0.35	-0.18	0.42	0.55	0.03	0.10
	(0.00)	(0.24)	(0.04)	(0.30)	(0.00)	(0.03)	(0.18)	(0.51)	(0.10)	(0.04)	(0.80)	(0.64)
Unionized*FCBA	0.22	-0.13	-0.36	-0.39	-0.02	-0.07	0.69	0.59	-0.75	-0.89	-0.33	-0.43
	(0.79)	(0.48)	(0.14)	(0.08)	(0.95)	(0.83)	(0.00)	(0.01)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.07)	(0.02)
Observations	17,402	17,402	22,893	22,893	33,082	33,082	43,212	43,212	33,082	33,082	43,212	43,212

(*) Column (I) shows estimates of the coefficients of a benefit availability probit regression on work, firm and labour force characteristics.
Column (II) shows estimates of the coefficients of the selection equation marginal effects of use of benefit in a selection model of use of benefit conditional on benefit availability.

(**) The selection model for flexible hours uses the 1999-2000 sample.

NOTE: (1) Both models include controls for hours of work, year and location availability regression includes controls for hours of work and a quadratic on experience

(2) A strata reflects the geographic location from where the firm is more likely to draw their workers. It is defined by the set of observations in a given province, industry, and for a given firm size.

(3) FCBA stands for Females of Child Bearing Age

APPENDIX B: METHODOLOGY

The theoretical background for this paper is rooted in Becker's (1965, 1991) new home economics and on the theory of the firm. If certain family oriented benefits and workplace arrangements exist, they must benefit either employers, via increased employee productivity, or employees, via contributions that improve their family life. It is assumed that the benefit/cost to the employee of workplace benefits and arrangements can be captured by looking at employee attachment to the firm.

The use of benefits among workers is affected by their preferences, with individuals with families, or planning to start families, (presumably) placing a higher premium on family friendly working conditions in the workplace. In particular, one could expect that women, because they share a higher burden of family responsibilities, will be more likely to be drawn to fields where the job is more likely to make allowances for family demands.[13] However, it is not obvious that we should observe a stronger correlation between female workers and use or availability of benefits. Although it is generally true that women are more likely to place a higher weight on family friendly benefits because of their higher responsibilities (or interest in responsibilities) in this domain, it is important to realize that it is sufficient that the benefit be available to one worker in the family. The emphasis that women put on family friendly benefits does not necessarily imply that they seek to access these benefits through their own jobs, particularly in the case of family benefits involving access to childcare or eldercare. It is possible that male partners have better access to these benefits and that females in turn use their husbands' benefits to achieve their own optimal level of career commitment. Hence, we may not find a strong link between gender and benefit use.

Individuals that worry about dividing their time among home production and labour market activities will optimally use benefits (B^U) depending on their preferences and the parameters of a home production technology. Typically, we expect the use of benefits to be a function of the number (D) and age (A) of dependents and on the presence of a partner that can share care responsibilities (P).

$$B^U = D\,(D, A\,P; ?) \qquad (1)$$

where $?$ is a parameter representing individual heterogeneity (possibly cultural) regarding home production. Equation (1) suggests that those individuals more likely to face work-family conflict, i.e. to have high costs of home production (more or younger children) or less flexibility to manage care responsibility (partner is absent)

---

[13] Roxburgh (1999) reports substantial gender differences in the influence of parenthood and social support on job satisfaction. Co-worker support is more important for men's job satisfaction, while partner's support is highly significant for women's job satisfaction. Vermeulen and Mustard (2000) use the Canadian National Population Health Survey to look at gender differences in job strain, social support at work, and psychological distress.

will be more likely to use benefits. If this is the case, we could conclude that benefits contribute to lessen this conflict. If workers were randomly distributed across firms, a probit estimation procedure should provide estimates of the influence of each factor on the use for a given benefit. However, that is hardly to be expected as individuals work in firms or areas with different probabilities of offering family friendly benefits. Therefore, workers preferences are not the only determinant of family friendly practices usage.

Organizations themselves are constrained in the supply of the benefits. Family friendly work practices impose different costs on different types of firms.[14] For example, flexible or part-time work schedules work well in some industries but poorly in others; on-site childcare can only be offered when the employer has a sufficiently large group of workers to sustain the center. Firms with a substantial amount of staff turnover may be uninterested in offering employment insurance supplements, since the amortization period for such a benefit will be short. Also, firms that want to attract and retain skilled employees from a labour market characterized with skills shortages will benefit more from offering compensation packages that are attractive to their employee demographic groups.[15] It is expected that firms with a young and highly skilled labour force will be more responsive to worker demands for a family friendly work environment, while firms drawing from a saturated low-skilled labour market have little or no need to offer family friendly work environments, as these employees are less likely to want to trade wages for benefits. Consequently, the increasing number of qualified females in the labour force may exert pressure on employers to provide a family friendly work environment. Finally, the degree of unionization in the industry and the strength of any union-firm relationship may also influence a firm's decision to offer a family friendly benefit. Union power favours the possibility of strong presence of workers concerns in the negotiation of benefits and a greater pressure on the provision of additional benefits.[16]

Therefore, firms that want to increase the productivity of their existing employees by offering family friendly benefits will optimally choose to make this benefits available (B^A) according to the marginal costs and marginal gains of implementing the benefit, which we summarize as C_B, G_B.

$$B^A = S\,(C_B,\ G_B) \qquad (2)$$

As long as employees with a propensity to demand family benefits are not randomly distributed across all firms, the availability constraint stated in equation (2) introduces a selection bias on the ordinary probit

[14] Heywood et Al. (2005)
[15] The Washington Post, Sunday, June 12, 2005; Page K01.

estimates for benefit use, as these are based on the sample of workers for whom the benefit is available. We will estimate instead the joint bivariate distribution of use and availability (Heckman (1974)) to obtain the estimates of the probability of use free of this selection bias. Let us define a variable, *B*, representing a family benefit, where *B = 1* if the worker uses that benefit, and *B = 0* otherwise.

$$B = B_U \quad \text{if} \quad B_A > 0 \qquad (3)$$

$$B_U = x\beta + e$$

$$B_A = z? + ?$$

The dependent variable *B* is only observed (B_U) if $B_A > 0$, where B_A is a variable indicating whether a benefit is available to the employee, *x* and *z* are vector of regressors, and the error terms *e* and *?* are jointly normally distributed, independently of *x* and *z*, with zero expectations. The vector *x* includes variables that predict the current employee use of benefits, while the vector *z* includes variables that predict the employee's selection into firms offering the benefit. That vector includes employee characteristics the employer may wish to retain/attract, and firm and labour market characteristics that would affect the provision of benefits.

Equation (2) is a reduced form expression for benefit availability. The determination of benefit availability is itself a complex process. First, availability is only observed for individuals who decided to work, which may lead to sample selection issues.[17] In this respect our estimates are conditional on employment and we implicitly assume that a wider availability of workplace benefits would have a negligible impact on whether an individual chooses to work or not.[18] In addition, it is likely that workers access to benefits embodies a trade off between family friendly benefits and other forms of compensation. This implies that workers may be sorting themselves into firms according to the likelihood that benefits are provided. The demand for benefits can therefore be modeled as the result of a simultaneous choice over wages and other job characteristics that influence the provision of benefits.[19] However, this only models the availability/provision of benefits. Most studies concern themselves with this aspect of the incidence of benefits. Our work abstracts from this type of selection to focus on the factors that affect the actual use of benefits. This allows us to ask questions about whether benefits are used by workers with families and whether or not use of benefits would expand were benefits made more readily available. We can answer these questions with our stylized model. Probit

---

[16] See Rochon (2000) for a report on work and family provisions in Canadian collective agreements

[17] Blank (1990) finds that this type of selectivity is unlikely to influence the estimated coefficients of benefit availability

[18] A wider availability of publicly provided benefits, especially subsidized childcare, would on the other hand likely have an impact. See Baker et Al (2005), and Lefebvre and Merrigan (2005)

[19] Averett and Hotchkiss (1995)

estimates of equation (1) provides estimates of the influence of demographic characteristics on the probability of using benefits among those who have benefits available, whereas the corrected use equation in (3) provides estimates of the parameters influencing the *marginal* probability of use (that is, the probability of use among all workers; those who have benefits and those who do not). By comparing the two sets of estimates we gain insight into the usefulness of family friendly benefits to mitigate work-family conflict and into the selection process of workers into firms with benefits. Suppose that corrected estimates of the demographic variables that should trigger use are significant, but the conventional estimates of the same variables were not.

This suggests that work family conflict does not affect use among those who have the benefit available, which in turn supports the hypothesis of a mismatch between use and availability. Alternatively, if corrected estimates of the explanatory variables are not significant but conventional estimates are, it suggests that workers are using these benefits to solve work-family conflict. In other words, if workers with high levels of family conflict tend to work in firms that offer telework, conventional estimates will overstate the importance of family characteristics on use of telework --when compared with estimates obtained under a selection model. If, on the other hand, workers with high levels of family conflict do not have access to this benefit, conventional estimates will understate the effect of family characteristics on use of telework.

According to our model, use of benefits will depend on the family structure (captured through indicators for number and age of children and an indicator for marital status) and possibly on the demands of the job (measured by usual hours of work). Additionally, it is plausible that workers from different cultures feel very strongly about the proper way to deal with family responsibilities and work demands, or that recent immigrants may face a different set of choices regarding family benefits due to less knowledge of Canadian institutions. We control for this heterogeneity in the technology of home production by including an indicator for Canadian born and for Caucasian ethnicity.[20]

We measure the marginal cost and gains to firms of offering benefits with a vector of workplace characteristics that include five indicators for industry (manufacturing, construction and transportation, commercial, financial, other services, with primary industries as the reference group), four occupational indicators (management, professional, technical, clerical, with production workers as the reference group), five indicators for region (Atlantic, Quebec, Alberta, British Columbia and the Prairies (Manitoba and Saskatchewan), with Ontario as the reference group) and three indicators for firm size ("between 20 and 49

[20] Caputo (2000) reports that, in the US, race is a determinant of benefit incidence

workers", "50 to 499" and "more than 500", with firms that have 1 to 19 workers being the reference group) to account for the technological constraints that firms may face in offering family friendly benefits. In addition, we include variables for tenure, experience, three indicators for numbers of hours worked and four educational indicators (high school graduate, non-university post secondary education, bachelor degree and graduate studies). These variables consider that firms may use benefits to attract/retain skilled workers and/or capture the choice that workers have taken in the past regarding career paths. We also include an indicator for whether the worker is unionized or covered by collective agreement since unionization may affect the likelihood of certain benefits being offered.

Finally, to account for the fact that labour market conditions affect the supply of benefits, we include a measure of the fraction of skilled workers and skilled working women in the corresponding strata.[21] These variables will indicate to what extent the employer is facing a tight skilled labour market and whether there exists a large pool of skilled women from which the firm may wish to draw skilled workers. In addition, to account for the amount of pressure that employers encounter within the work force to offer family friendly benefits, we incorporate a measure of the fraction of women in the strata that are of child bearing age. We introduce an interaction term of this variable with the union indicator to discern whether the effect of unionization depends on the composition of the strata. We also include an indicator for whether or not the strata is highly unionized.[22]

In order to increase the number of benefit users, we pool together all four waves of the survey (1999-2002) and control for survey year in our analysis. Since we have a panel of firms, it is plausible that observations corresponding to workers in the same firm will not be independently distributed. Therefore, we report robust Huber-White standard errors, allowing for clustering among firms. We restrict the sample to those workers who provided answers to the benefits and labour characteristics questions. We end up with 33,082 observations for female workers and 43,212 for males.[23]

---

[21] A strata reflects the geographic location from where the firm is more likely to draw their workers. It is defined by the set of observations in a given province, industry, and for a given firm size.

[22] We consider that a strata has a high degree of unionization if more than a quarter of its workers is unionized. While the choice of this threshold is arbitrary, we tried different definitions of high degree of unionization with no effect on our estimates.

[23] Means for the main characteristics of the sample are reported in Table A1. See Comfort, Johnson and Wallace (2003) for detailed tabulation of the first wave of the WES raw data.

References

Averett, S. and Hotchkiss, J. (1995) "The Probability of receiving benefits at different hours of work" *The American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*, Vol. 85, No2

Baker, M., Gruber, J. and Milligan, K. (2005) "Universal Childcare, Maternal Labour Supply and Family Wellbeing". *NBER* working paper #11832

Barbeau, Carol (2001) "Work-related child-care centres in Canada – 2001." Human Resources Development Canada Labour Program.

Bardoel, E. Anne, Simon A. Moss, Kosmas Smyrnios and Phyllis Tharenou. (1999) "Employee characteristics associated with the provision of work-family policies and programs." *International Journal of Manpower* 20(8) 563-576

Barnett R. (1999) "A new Work Life Model for the 21st Century" *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 562 143-58

Becker, G. (1991) "*A treatise on the family*." Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

__(1965) "A theory of the allocation of time." *The Economic Journal* 75(200) 493-517

Caputo, R. "Race and Marital History as Correlates of Women's Access to Family-Friendly Employee Benefits" (2000) *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* Volume 21, Number 4. Pages: 365 - 385

Cox, Amy G. and Harriet B. Presser. (2000) "Nonstandard employment schedules among American mothers: the relevance of marital status." In *Work and Family: Research Informing Policy*, ed. Parcel, Toby L. and Daniel B. Cornfield. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Comfort, Johnson and Wallace (2003) "Partime work and family friendly practices in Canadian workplaces" *The Evolving Workplace Series* Human Resources Development Canada.

Dalton, Dan R., and Debra J. Mesch (1990) "The impact of flexible scheduling on employee attendance and turnover." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35(2), 370-387

Duxbury, Linda, and Chris Higgins (2004) "Exploring the link between Work-life conflict and demands on Canada's Health System" National Study on Balancing Work, Family and Lifestyle. Report Three.http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/work-travail/index.html

Eaton, S. (2001) "If You Can Use Them: Flexibility Policies, Organizational Commitment, and Perceived Performance" *Industrial Relations*, vol.42, no 2 (April 2003)

Evans, J.M., "Firms Contribution to the Reconciliation between Work And Family Life" (2001). Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers # 48. Directorate for Education, Employment, Labour and Social Affairs. OECD.

Glass, Jennifer, and Lisa Riley. (1998) "Family responsive policies and employee retention following childbirth." *Social Forces* 76(4) 1401-1435

__ and Tetsushi Fujimoto. (1995) "Employer characteristics and the provision of family responsive policies." *Work & Occupation* 22(4) 380-411

Golden, Lonnie. (2001) "Flexible work schedules: which workers get them?" *American Behavioral Scientist* 44(7), 1157-1178

__(2001) "Flexible work schedules: what are we trading off to get them?" *Monthly Labor Review* March 2001, 50-67

Goff, Stephen J., Mount, Micheal K., and Rosemary L. Jamison (1990) "Employer supported child care, work/family conflict, and absenteeism: a field study." *Personnel Psychology* 43, 793-809

Goldberg, Wendy A., Greenberger, Ellen, Koch-Jones, Judith, O'Neil Robin, and Sharon Hamill (1989) "Attractiveness of child care and related employer-supported benefits and policies to married and single parents." *Child and Youth Care Quarterly* 18(1) 23-37

Gornick J., Meyers, M. and Ross, K. (1996) "Supporting the Employment of Mothers:Policy Variation across 14 Welfare States" *Luxembourg Income Studies* Working Paper # 139

Gray, H. (2002) "Family Friendly Working: What a Performance! An Analysis of the Relationship Between the Availability of Family Friendly Policies and Establishment Performance" Centre for Economic Performance. London School of Economics and Political Science.

Gunderson, Morley (2002) "Rethinking productivity from a workplace perspective." CPRN Discussion Paper No. W|17

Heywood, J. Siebert, W.S and Wei Xiangdong (2005). *IZA Discussion Paper No 1581*

Hofferth, Sandra L. (2000) "Effect of public and private policies on working after childbirth." In *Work and Family: Research Informing Policy*, ed. Parcel, Toby L. and Daniel B. Cornfield. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

Lefebvre, P. and Merrigan, P. "Low-fee ($5/day/child) Regulated Childcare Policy and the Labour Supply of Mothers with Young Children: A Natural Experiment from Canada" (2005). CIRANO Working Paper # 2005s-09.

Lero, Dona, et. al. (1993) "Workplace benefits and flexibility: a perspective on parents' experiences." Statistics Canada: Ottawa, Catalogue No. 89-530E

Lipsett, Brenda, and Mark Reesor. (1997) "Flexible work arrangements: evidence from the 1991 and 1995 Survey of Work Arrangements." Human Resources Development Canada, Research Paper R-97-10E

Lowe, Graham, S., and Grant Schellenberg (2001) "What's a good job? The importance of employment relationships." CPRN Study No. W|05

McDonald M., Phipps S. and Lethbridge L. (2005) "Taking its toll: The Influence of Paid and Unpaid Work on Women's Well-being" *Feminist Economics* 11(1), pp. 63-94Marshall, Katherine (2000) "Part-time by choice." Statistics Canada: Ottawa, Catalogue No. 75-001-XIE

Milkovich, George T., and Luis R. Gomez (1976) "Day care and selected employee work behaviors." *The Academy of Management Journal* 19(1), 111-115.

Miller, Thomas I. (1984) "The effects of employer-sponsored child care on employee absenteeism, turnover, productivity, recruitment or job satisfaction: what is claimed and what is known." *Personnel Psychology* 37, 277-289

Phipps, S.A. (2000) " Maternity and Parental Benefits in Canada: Are there Behavioural Implications" *Canadian Public Policy* vol. XXVI, no. 4

Riley and McClosky (1997) "Telecommuting as a Response to Helping People Balance Work and Family" in S. Parasuraman and Greenhaus, *Integrating Work and Family: Challenges and Choices for a Changing World*, Quorum: London.

Rochon, Charles Philippe, ed. (2000) "Work and family provisions in Canadian collective agreements." HRDC Labour Program

Roxburgh, Susan (1999) "Exploring the work and family relationship." *Journal of Family Issues* 20(6), 771-788

Social Development Canada (2005) "Early Chilhood Development Activities and Expenditures." Government of Canada Report 2003–2004
http://socialunion.gc.ca/ecd/2004/english/page03.html#section_7

Solomon, C (1994) "Work Family's Failing Grade: Why Today's initiatives are not enough" *Personnel Journal* 73, 73-87

Secret, Mary (2000) "Identifying the family, job, and workplace characteristics of employees who use work-family benefits." *Family Relations* 49(2) 217-225

Stone, Leroy O. (1994) "Dimensions of job-family tension." Statistics Canada: Ottawa, Catalogue No. 89-540E

Washington Post, the. "Dad-Friendly Benefits Must Be Nurtured: Corporate Culture, Not Official Policy, Still Governs at Work"